

In 1962 Ludwig Alsdorf published an article in the *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd-Asiens*, vol. 6, called “*Sasajātaka und Śaśa-avadāna*”. In it he considers a number of stories, found in various *Jātaka* and *Avadāna* collections, two of which — concerning ‘The (Wise) Hare’ — give his piece its title. He attempts to show how these stories evolved, and how the ideal they exemplify changes from that of generosity, *dāna*, to that of ‘good friendship’, *kalyāṇamittatā*. In doing so he also suggests the way in which some well-known suttas in the Pali Canon dealing with the latter topic (S I 87–9, V 2–4) have come to have their present form. In a future publication I hope to assess these arguments, which seem to me generally correct, but mistaken on a number of points; I will attempt thus to arrive at a revised text and translation of these suttas, the basic element of which we may call, after L. Feer, ‘The Discourse on Following a Good Friend’ (*Kalyāṇamitta-sevanā-sutta*).¹ The present PTS texts and translations of these passages are seriously defective. In this article I shall be concerned with Alsdorf’s other subject, the grammatical analysis of the terms *kalyāṇamitta* and *kalyāṇamittatā* (hereafter *k-m.* and *k-m-tā* respectively). The entries for these terms in PED are unsatisfactory, and they receive a bewildering variety of renderings in published PTS translations. Alsdorf has shown how they are to be correctly analysed and translated; I hope here to confirm and elaborate his account by a comprehensive survey of the use of the terms in all major Pali texts.²

Often, but not always, ‘good friend’, *k-m.*, is a technical term for someone who acts in more or less specific ways as a ‘helper on the Path’. A few words may be useful on the relationship between this sense of the term and the wider treatment of friendship (*mittatā*, *mettā* in some of its uses, *sahāyatā*, etc.) in Buddhism. It makes sense, I think, to distinguish three (overlapping) areas or levels.

Firstly, there is the simple sense in which trustworthiness, reciprocity and perhaps a consequent mutual regard are extolled. Anthropology suggests that this universal phenomenon need not necessarily involve our modern sense of friendship as two or more persons' mutual liking and enjoyment of each others' company, although of course it frequently does; the relationship involved can be a straightforwardly reciprocal, indeed quasi-contractual, exchange of goods and services.³ The miscreant to be avoided here is the one who betrays his friend, in Pali *mitta-dubbha* (or one of many related forms), a theme which recurs constantly throughout the Jātakas and in numerous places in the Sutta-piṭaka. These notions are not specific to Buddhism or even to India.⁴ A Buddhist (but not Indian) example can be provided from the *Paññāsa-Jātaka* collection. A hunter who has saved the life of Jambucitta, the snake-king, demands from him a (magic) snake-noose, used for capturing celestial maidens. At first Jambucitta demurs, then gives it to the hunter, who exclaims 'I see you are an ally, Jambucitta, a friend who keeps his promise. I did you a good (service), and (now) you have returned one to me'.⁵ These sorts of sentiment are ubiquitous in the Indian collections of gnomic or didactic poetry known as the *subhāṣita* literature,⁶ in the recently edited *Nīti* texts from Burma, which share a common stock of 'worldly wisdom' with the Sanskritic tradition,⁷ and in collections of fables like the Pañcatantra, whose stories are grouped according to whether they demonstrate the 'Separation' or 'Winning of Friends'.⁸ In these contexts, one quite naturally finds words for friend — notably *mitta* — joined with others: *ñātimitta*, 'relatives and friends' (in upper-class English, perhaps, 'one's people'), or *mittāmacca*, 'friends and colleagues'. *Amacca* can mean 'king's minister', and the compound is often used for a king's entourage at court. It is found in (complementary) opposition to *ñātisalohitā*, 'kin and blood-relations' at Sn p. 104. The following version of 'a friend in need is a friend indeed' comes from the Jātakas, and is taken up by later commentarial literature in much more specialised contexts (Ja V 146, 21–4, appropriated at As 349–50, Spk II 252): 'He who is grateful, mindful of past

benefits, a steadfast and devoted good friend (*k-m.*), who dutifully does what is necessary when (his friend is) in trouble, such a one they call a good man'.⁹

Secondly, there is the level at which such sentiments are 'Buddhicised' by being set in a framework of Buddhist morality. This can be done artificially: at Ja VI 14–5, for instance, a series of verses of the general trustworthiness/reciprocity kind are interpreted by the commentary in a specifically Buddhist way. In the commentary to the verse 'one who honours (his friends) receives honour (in return), one who praises (them) receives praise. He who does not betray his friends wins fame and a good reputation', we read that "one who praises" here means one who praises good friends (*k-m.*) such as the Buddha, etc., and receives praise in return in another life'.¹⁰ It can also be done less artificially, as in the Sigālovāda Sutta, 'The Layman's Vinaya' as Buddhaghosa called it. In an extended discussion of good and bad friends, quite general and not specifically Buddhist ideas — we are warned against, *inter alios*, gamblers, drunks and (false) flatterers — are organised into lists and systematised in a characteristically Buddhist way. Although the term *k-m.* does not appear in this text, its syntactically equivalent opposite *pāpamitta* does, in a way which shows it to be semantically identical to the uncompounded form (D III 187, 19–21). Many of the sentiments expressed in relation to good friends are elsewhere said to characterise a *k-m.*, and the commentary uses the term (Sv 949 on D III 187, I foll.). (See further below, p. 57 on the compounded and uncompounded forms of *kalyāṇa/mitta*.)

We reach, thirdly, a specifically Buddhist sense of the term when it is applied, with varying degrees of exact denotation, to someone who helps another on the Buddhist Path. The Cullaniddesa (Nidd II 227–8) expresses this in a familiarly schematic way:

There are two (kinds of) friends: householder friends and monastic (lit. 'homeless') friends.

What is the householder friend? Here, someone gives what is hard to give, gives up what is hard to give up, does

what is hard to do and endures what is hard to endure; he reveals his own secrets (to you) but conceals (your) secrets (from others); in misfortune he does not forsake you, he will even lay down his life for you,¹¹ and he does not despise you in distress. What is the monastic friend? Here, a monk is kind, charming, venerable, to be respected, willing to speak and be spoken to; he speaks profound words and never exhorts groundlessly, he urges (one) on in the higher morality and in the meditation-practice of the four foundations of mindfulness.¹²

Versions of both of these descriptions occur in the Āṅguttara, addressed by the Buddha to monks (A IV 31–2), and the first three phrases of the householder-friend are predicated elsewhere of the kind of monk who is ‘a friend to be followed’ (*mitto sevitabbo*) (A I 286), so it would be wrong to assume that the ‘household’ virtues do not apply to monks. Nonetheless, the distinction is familiar enough; most of the householder-friend passage occurs in the Sigālovāda Sutta, where a friend ‘shows the way to heaven’, and clearly the monastic friend here is concerned with the Path to *nibbāna*. This symbolic dichotomy is a common way in which Buddhist texts accommodate, by subordination, ideas and values not specifically or originally Buddhist. (The virtues of lay friendship, although not specifically Buddhist, inculcate habits and ideals of prudence and moderation, which are the essence of Buddhist *sīla*, so it would be absurd to suggest that there is anything un-Buddhist about them.) Although this symbolic dichotomy does reflect an obvious difference of emphasis in different spheres of Buddhism, I shall cite passages below in which monks are good friends to laymen, and indeed laymen are good friends to each other, in a specifically Buddhist sense (see Sections III 2 (iii) and III 4). In its most specific sense, a monastic good friend is an instructor, with the particular function of choosing a subject for his pupil’s meditation practice (see Section III 2 (iv)). This particular role of a ‘good friend’ should also be seen in the light of the many passages which emphasise the need for harmony and friendly relations among communities of

monks (e.g. Majjhima Suttas 15, 31, 48, 103, Vinaya Mahāvagga X, etc.). Here the term *mettā* is frequently used: and here the translation of it as ‘loving-kindness’,¹³ which is usual when it refers to the meditation practice of the Brahnavihāras or to one of the Perfections, is less appropriate than the etymologically accurate ‘friendship’ or ‘amity’.

Although in what follows I organise the material in accordance with the syntactical form and usage of the terms *k-m.* and *k-m-tā*, I have tried to choose examples which further exemplify and clarify these three levels in the Buddhist treatment of friendship.

II

As Alsdorf showed, the following are the grammatically possible analyses of the compound *kalyāṇamitta*:

1. as a karmadhāraya, = ‘good friend (sc. to others)’ — *kalyāṇo mitto (aññesam) hotī ti kalyāṇamitto*.
2. as a tatpuruṣa, with (a) a masculine first member, = ‘the friend of a good man (good men)’ — *kalyānassa purisassa (kalyāṇam purisānam) mitto hotī ti kalyāṇamitto*.
or with (b) a neuter first member, = ‘a friend of the good (of Virtue)’ — *yad kalyāṇam (e.g. silam) tassa mitto hotī ti kalyāṇamitto*.
3. as a bahuvrīhi, = ‘who has a good friend (good friends)’ — *assa kalyāṇo mitto hotī (kalyāṇā mittā honti) ti kalyāṇamitto*.

As Alsdorf says, although many translators, both modern and in the Tibetan tradition, have chosen 2a or 2b, neither of these is correct. For the karmadhāraya use he cites a phrase from the *Kalyāṇamitta-sevanā-sutta*, spoken by the Buddha, with reference to all beings, *maman . . . kalyāṇamittam āgamma*, ‘with (or depending on) me as (their) good friend’ (S I 88, V 3,4). As I shall show, it is used in this way of many others also. For the bahuvrīhi sense he cites S I 83, in which the kings Ajātasattu and Paseinati are said to be *pāpamitto* and *kalyāṇamitto* respectively: as the commentary

explains (Spk I 154, cf. Ps I 189) they have bad and good friends like Devadatta in the one case and monks like Sāriputta in the other.¹⁴ We may notice here two more instances. At Th 682 *k-m.* occurs in a list of virtuous qualities, the possession of which would put an end to *dukkha*. As the commentary notes (Th-a III 7), this is to be taken as ‘endowed with good friends’ (*kalyānehi mittehi samannāgato*). At It 10 a *kalyāṇamitto puggalo* ‘abandons what is unprofitable and develops what is profitable’ — and the commentary explains that this is because such a person, depending upon his good friend (i.e. his teacher or instructor) acquires, *inter alia*, the knowledge that all beings have their own *kamma*. Here we find the karmadhāraya and bahuvrīhi senses together: *kalyāṇamitto puggalo kalyāṇamittam nissāya kammasakatā-ñānam uppādeti* (It-a I 65).¹⁵

The abstract noun *kalyāṇamittatā* could, in theory, be used to express both the state of ‘being a good friend’ in the karmadhāraya sense, and that of ‘having a good friend’ in the bahuvrīhi sense.¹⁶ But as Alsdorf reported and I hope to prove, the former possibility is in fact never found in the texts. The commentary to It 10 just cited gives a form of explanation for *k-m-tā* which is found very frequently: ‘a person who has a good friend, endowed with the good qualities of morality and the rest . . . a helper, is called *k-m.* (Being in) this condition is *k-m-tā*'.¹⁷ Similarly, when the Buddha says that he knows of nothing worse for the arising of bad states (*akusala-dhammā*) and the destruction of good ones than *pāpamittatā* (A I 13), the commentary (Mp I 80–1) explains that ‘the person who has bad, disreputable friends is called *pāpamitto*. The state (or condition) of being one who has bad friends is called *p-m-tā*'.¹⁸ The commentary to Thī 213 is yet more explicit: in K. R. Norman’s translation, the verse reads ‘The state of having noble friends has been described by the sage with reference to the world; resorting to noble friends even a fool would be wise’, and the commentary, after giving the standard explanation of *k-m-tā*, adds that it means *kalyāṇa-mittavantatā*, literally ‘the state (or simply “fact”) of having good friends’.¹⁹ The condition of having good friends is not merely a result of good fortune

(Alsdorf’s *das Glück* as opposed to *der Vorzug*, op. cit. p. 15): as the sub-commentary to the Dīgha Nikāya remarks (Linatthavaṇṇanā III 225, on Sv 978 on D III 212), in elucidation of *pāpa-sampavañkatā*, ‘being inclined to bad (friends)’ (on which see further below, p. 64–5), ‘the state of mind by which one is inclined to bad (friends) is itself (a part of) bad friendship’.²⁰

III

1. ‘Good friend(s)’ as uncompounded adjective and noun.

I have mentioned that the Sigālovāda Sutta and its commentary use the uncompounded and compounded forms of *kalyāṇa/mitta* and *pāpa/mitta* with no difference in sense. The uncompounded form is found elsewhere, used of both householder and monastic friends. At M I 11 (= A III 389) among the things a monk is to avoid are *pāpake mitte*, glossed by the commentaries as ‘disreputable, immoral, false friends, enemies (in the guise of friends)’,²¹ the latter two terms being commonly used in lay contexts. At Dhp 78, in a verse which would be at home in a general, gnomic or aphoristic text, we read ‘do not associate with bad friends (*pāpake mitte*), nor the lowest of men; associate with good friends (*mitte kalyāne*), noble men’. The commentary (Dhp-a II 110–2) tells the story of the monk Channa, who reviled Sāriputta and Moggallāna, although they were his *kalyāṇamittā*. The passage reproduced at Nidd II 227–8 on the monastic friend is introduced in the Anguttara (IV 32) simply with the words ‘monks, a friend endowed with seven qualities²² is to be followed’; and it is regularly found in commentarial exegeses of the compounded form *k-m*. In some other places the uncompounded form occurs (the commentaries give the compound), where the context is plainly monastic: Sn 338, Th 249, 588, 681.

2. the karmadhāraya ‘good friend’.

(i) the Buddha.

As we saw, in the *Kalyāṇamitta-sevanā-sutta* the Buddha describes himself as the good friend of ‘beings’ generally.

Here, it is the fact that the Buddha is, as PED has it (p. 199), ‘the spiritual friend par excellence’, which gives force to the *prima facie* surprising assertion that *k-m-tā* is ‘the whole’ (*sakalam eva*) of the holy life. (This is not the only explanation of the sentiment, however.)²³ In a long discussion of the ‘good friend’ as the giver of a meditation subject the Visuddhimagga (98 foll.) says that ‘it is only the Fully Enlightened One who possesses all the aspects of a good friend’,²⁴ quoting the *K-m-s-sutta* passage. Such a special eminence of the Buddha is not, however, otherwise stressed (though perhaps it is so obvious as to go without saying). At A V 67 King Pasenadi falls at the Buddha’s feet and extols his virtues, one of which is to demonstrate what are elsewhere called the ‘ten instances of good talk’ (*kathāvatthūni*). But any monk can exhibit these also (M III 113, etc.), and the Visuddhimagga tells us that one of the senses of ‘proper resort’ (*gocara*) for a monk is ‘a good friend who exhibits the ten instances of good talk’, where plainly any monk can be such (19). Of course, the Buddha himself, in his progress through many lives to reach *nibbāna*, needed the help of such good friends himself (Cp-a 285, 287 foll., 311).

(ii) *other famous monks as exemplars.*

In the Visuddhimagga passage just cited, it is said that when the Buddha is dead, one may receive a meditation subject from any of the eighty great disciples; when they are gone, one may turn to other arahants, but not (pace PED p. 199) to any arahant, only to one who has reached enlightenment by means of the meditation subject which he recommends. Then the list descends through the other kinds of noble person (*ariyapuggala*) to the ‘ordinary man’ (*puthujjana*—clearly an ordinary monk must be meant), and finally comes to a person who knows only one collection (*sangīti*) and its commentary, and who is ‘conscientious’ (*lajjī*). Such a teacher will pass on the tradition and heritage (*vamsa, paveṇī*) rather than his own opinion; the text adds, somewhat surprisingly perhaps, that an arahant will only describe the path he himself has traversed, whereas the learned man (*bahussuto*) will explain a meditation subject more generally, ‘showing a broad track, like a big elephant

going through the jungle’.

Apart from this particular connexion with giving a meditation subject, famous monks are said to be the good friends of laymen (e.g. King Pasenadi at S I 83) and of monks (Channa at Dhp-a II 110–2, both cited above). A long passage found often in the later literature (e.g. Vibh-a 269 foll., Sv 777 foll., Ps I 281 foll., It-a III 78 foll.) names specific monks who may be taken as a good friend in the process of getting rid of each of the five hindrances (*nīvaranā*). Each *nīvaranā* is abandoned by a differing list of factors, but *k-m-tā* appears in each list. For the first, lust (*kāmacchanda*), we read that ‘lust is abandoned in one who cultivates good friends who delight in the development of [sc. the meditation on (S.C.)] the foul, like the Elder Tissa, the worker on the foul’.²⁵ The other *nīvaranā* are then counteracted by taking an exemplar, as follows:

ill-will (*vyāpāda*): ‘good friends who delight in the development of amity (*mettā*) like the Elder Assagutta’

stiffness-and-torpor (*thīna-middha*): ‘good friends who have abandoned stiffness-and-torpor, like the Elder Mahākassapa’

agitation-and-worry (*uddhacca-kukkucca*): ‘good friends who are expert in the Vinaya, like the Elder Upāli’

uncertainty (*vicikicchā*): ‘good friends who are resolute in faith, like the Elder Vakkali’.

The texts containing these passages were clearly intended for use by monks generations after the lifetime of the good friends mentioned. No doubt they were meant to have a similar function to that of the many exemplary stories of great monks found in texts like the Thera- and Therīgāthā, the Apadāna, the opening of the Anguttara commentary, etc. (as indeed to that of inspirational and exemplary hagiographies the world over).

(iii) *any monk or layperson who advises and encourages.*

By far the commonest use of the karmadhāraya *k-m.* is to denote monks, and in some cases laymen, whose advice and/or example may encourage others. In the standard commentarial gloss on the (monastic) use of the term, such a

monk is an *ovādaka-bhikkhu*, perhaps ‘monastic instructor’; this is not a status necessarily separate from that of preceptor (*upajjhāya*) or teacher (*ācariya*), although it can be. For instance, in the commentary to an elaborate simile comparing the world and its pleasures to a drinking bowl full of poison, and where someone advises a thirsty man both of the advantages and the disadvantages of drinking from it, such an advisor is called ‘a *k-m.* like a teacher, preceptor, etc.’ (*ācariy’upajjhāyādiko k-m.*) (Spk II 120 on S II 110). Vism 121 discusses a situation in which it is not possible to find ‘a *k-m.* as a teacher or the equivalent, a preceptor or the equivalent’ (*ācariya-, upajjhāyasamam*). At Mil 380 a monk is to depend on any fellow monk as a *k-m.* (*k-mittam sabrahmacāriṃ upanissāya vasitabbam*), as long as he is (in Miss Horner’s translation):

of few wants, contented, a preacher of asceticism, one living in submissiveness, possessed of good habits, modest, well behaved, revered, to be respected, a speaker, one who can be spoken to, one who reproves (for an offence), censuring evil, an exhorter, instructor, adviser, one who gladdens, arouses, incites and delights (his fellow Brahma-farers).²⁶

This can be taken as a definition of a *k-m.*, as also can the qualities extolled in the following: at A I 116–7, a successful monk is compared to a successful shop-keeper (*pāpaniko*). Both have three qualities, being intelligent (*cakkhumā*), capable (*vidhuro*²⁷), and possessed of a means of support (*nissaya-sampanno*). In the case of a monk, this means that he understands as they really are (*yathābhūtam*) the Four Noble Truths, that he is energetic in avoiding bad states and developing good ones, and that (whereas the shopkeeper’s means of support is obviously financial) he frequents monks who are ‘learned, versed in scripture, who know the Dhamma and the Discipline, and the lists’.²⁸ He questions them on points of doctrine, and they resolve his doubts. The commentary (Mp II 190) glosses the three qualities as wisdom (*paññā*), energy (*viriya*), and following good friends (*k-m-sevanā*), but adds that it would be wrong to understand

these qualities as being attained in that order. Rather, ‘dependence on good friends’ (*k-m-upanissaya*) comes first, energy next, and finally arahantship (*arahatta*). Naturally, just as the state of ‘dependence’ (*nissaya*) when construed as an institutionally-marked state of subordination within the Sangha,²⁹ is only an introductory or disciplinary status, so ‘following good friends’ is only appropriate for a beginner. At M I 477 foll. (cp. A IV 75 foll.) arahants, for whom there is ‘nothing more to do through diligence’ are contrasted with learners (*sekhā*) for whom there is, and who are said to ‘follow good friends’. In a list then given of seven (types of) persons, ‘following good friends’ is said only of those for whom there is ‘something more to be done through diligence’, not for those — the ‘released both ways (*ubhatobhāga-vimutto*) and the ‘released by wisdom’ (*paññā-vimutto*) — for whom there is not.

As far as monks are concerned, then, the position is clear. But the term *k-m.* is also applied to laypersons. Monks can be *k-m.* to laymen, who can also be *k-m.* to each other. At A V 336, the layman Nandiya, who has come to Sāvatthi both to do business and to see the Buddha, is told by him to bear in mind certain things, including the Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha. The last are referred to as *k-m.*, and Nandiya is to reflect ‘it is a gain for me, it is good fortune for me, that I have good friends who are compassionate and desire my welfare, who instruct and teach (me)’. The commentary remarks that ‘here recollecting the (good qualities of the) Saṅgha (*saṅghānussati*) is taught, on account of (its containing) good friends’ (*k-m-vasena*) (Mp V 81). The term is also used of laymen. In one version of the story of Prince Sumana, who was the younger brother of Padumuttara Buddha and who later became Ānanda, he is deliberating with the king’s ministers as to what boon he shall ask of his father. Receiving the advice from some to be allowed to wait on the Buddha for three months, he accepts and tells them ‘you are *k-m.* to me’ (Sv 489). In a commentarial elaboration of the long simile comparing consciousness in the body to the leader of a town (S IV 194–5), we are told that this leader is a young prince sent to the town by his father, the king of the region,

but who on arriving quickly became a drunkard, thanks to mixing with bad friends (*pāpa-mitta-saṃsaggena*). The king sends two messengers, who reform him. The king is the Buddha, the young prince an inexperienced bhikkhu, and the two messengers are concentration and insight (Spk III 61–2).

(For other uses of *k-m.* as a karmadhāraya compare: Vin I 21–2 and Sp 968, Vin II 8, III 19 and Sp 215, Spk I 202, III 6, Pj I 126, 148, It-a I 43, 116, II 62, 63, 91, 129, 167, 172, 180 foll., Kv-a 30, Pp 41, Mil 373, 408, Pet 87, 210, 231, Pj II I 341 on Sn 338.)

(iv) *the giver of a meditation subject (kammaṭṭhāna-dāyaka)*.

Given the importance of meditation in the Buddhist Path, it is hardly surprising that a *k-m.* should offer guidance in this area. Indeed, we are told that having a good friend is one of the (necessary) bases of meditative attainment (*jhāna*) (Pet 149).³⁰ Vajirañāṇa³¹ has pointed out how the Buddha is shown in the suttas giving advice on meditation to his monks, and we have seen that in the list of meditation-subject-givers in Vism 89, 98 foll., the Buddha comes first. Such a *k-m.* is called an *ācariya* (ibid. 99), who should be senior (100); and elsewhere it is said that the relationship between teacher and pupil should be like that of father and son (Vin I 60). It may be thought that such an hierarchical and indeed quasi-kin relation does away with any real notion of friendship, and indeed in the later literature where *k-m.* appears as a technical term for a *kammaṭṭhāna-dāyaka* (e.g. As 168, Abhidh-av verses 800–3, quoting A IV 32), it may seem to have become a mere title. But one should remember here that the choice of a particular subject for meditation is made according to the particular character of the monk concerned, and the Vism goes on to give a long account of these various character-types or ‘temperaments’ (*cariyā*).³² Naturally, it being a text, this is done rather schematically, according to a fixed set of ‘elements’ (*dhātu*) and ‘humours’ (*dosa*); and no doubt a clumsy or inconsiderate teacher might well apply the analyses mechanically. But one can easily imagine how a skilled teacher would need a sensitive insight into his pupil’s

strengths and weaknesses, in order properly to guide him in this difficult area — an act of friendship indeed!³³

This late, very specific and indeed not very frequent use of the idea of the ‘good friend’ seems to me to have been rather over-emphasised in the secondary literature. It is worth noticing here just how specific it is in relation to the whole gamut of uses of the idea of a *k-m.* which I am presenting. 3. *the bahuvrīhi ‘one who has a good friend’.*

I shall cite examples of this usage under two heads: the term *k-m.* used in this way by itself; and used in the common group of three terms, *k-m.*, *kalyāṇa-sahāyo*, *kalyāṇa-sampavañko*.

(i) From the mere form *k-m.* of course one cannot decide between the karmadhāraya and bahuvrīhi interpretations, but the correct sense is almost always obvious from the context. At Th 505, for instance, we read simply that a *k-m.* bhikkhu will not grieve after death. Given verses 504 and 506, which read *kalyāṇa-silo*, ‘of good morality’, and *kalyāṇa-pañño*, ‘of good wisdom’, respectively, it is clear that *k-m.* must likewise be taken as a bahuvrīhi, ‘of (or with) good friends’. (It may be noticed that *-mitto* here occurs where we might expect, given the constant conjunction of *sīla*, *samādhi*, *paññā*, a reference to meditation, so perhaps there is an echo of the specific sense just discussed.) Similarly, at M I 43 the Buddha gives a long list of ‘expungings’ (*sallekha*), which include the thought ‘others may be *pāpamittā*, we shall be *k-m.*’. The context shows that this cannot mean that monks are to wish to be good friends to others: it is a list of humble aspirations, to be uttered by those in training, and is immediately preceded by the aspiration ‘others may be *dubbacā*, we shall be *subbacā*’. These words are to be taken in a passive sense, ‘difficult’ and ‘easy to speak to’ (see below on *do-* and *sovacassatā*), and so the monks are clearly to wish to have good friends and to be obedient and receptive to them. At S V 29 foll., each of another long list of qualities, endowed with which a monk will develop the Path, is compared to the dawn as the fore-runner (*pubbaṅgamam*, *pubbanimittam*) of the sun. One of these is *k-m-tā*, and the *k-m.* bhikkhu similarly presages the

(day)-light of wisdom; the other qualities are all compounds with *-sampanno*, and so *k-m.* here could be glossed as *kalyāṇamitta-sampanno*.³⁴

An interesting passage in the Āṅguttara suggests that in a certain (and certainly non-technical) sense a monk can be both one who has good friends and a good friend to others. Each of a list of qualities — reverence for the Teacher, the Dhamma, the Saṅgha, and for the training, the virtue of being easy to speak to (*sovacassatā*) and *k-m-tā* — is both possessed by a monk and aroused in others by him. ‘Here a monk has good friends, praises (such) good friendship, and encourages in (such) good friendship those other monks who do not have good friends; he speaks praise truly, justly and at the right time of (such) good friendship’ (A III 423–4).

(For other uses of *k-m.* as a bahuvrīhi, see A III 145, V 123–5, 146, 148–9, 153, 159, 161.)

(ii) The group of terms *k-m.*, *k-sahāyo*, *k-sampavañko* is found in the *Kalyāṇamitta-sevanā-sutta* and frequently elsewhere. *K-m.* is used in a bahuvrīhi sense, as is *k-sahāyo*, ‘one who has good companions’,³⁵ but *k-sampavañko* presents some problems. The corresponding Sanskrit text³⁶ has *kalyāṇamitra(tā)*, *kalyāṇasahāya(tā)*, *kalyāṇasamparka*. *Samparka* is a noun from the verb *sam-prc*, to mix or mingle. The nominal form *kalyāṇasamparkah* (which corresponds to Pali *-sampavañkatā*, as an abstract noun) is most obviously interpreted as a tatpuruṣa with the meaning ‘mixing with good people’ (= *kalyāṇair janaiḥ samparkah*). The adjectival form appears in the Sanskrit text as a plural, *kalyāṇasamparkāḥ*, agreeing with the first person plural verb *viharisyāmaḥ*, in the aspiration to be made by monks ‘we shall live *k-m.* (etc.)’. Given that the nominal form is a tatpuruṣa, this is best taken as a bahuvrīhi based on the tatpuruṣa, with the literal meaning ‘one of whom there is mixing with good people’, or in reasonable English, ‘one who mixes with good people’. In Pali, the etymology of *sampavañka* is unclear — as Alsdorf says, that given by PED is not credible. There are two common commentarial exegeses of the word, which are sometimes blended. Examples are: at Mp II 198 on A I 127, and Pp-a 219 on Pp 37, we read ‘*k-*

sampavañko ti kalyāṇesu sucipuggalesu sampavañko tanninna-tappona-tappabbhāramānaso ti attho. ‘The meaning of *k-s.* is “inclined to good, pure people, bent down towards them, sloping towards them, having a mind which leans towards them”. At Sv 1046 on D III 267, we read *cittena c'eva kāyena ca kalyāṇamittesu sampavañko, onato ti k-s.* ‘*K-s.* means inclined, bending towards good friends in both mind and body.’ All of these terms suggest the idea of bending, inclining, etc.³⁷ As an etymology for *sampavañka*, K. R. Norman suggests³⁸ *vāñka* (Sanskrit *vakra*), with the prefixes *saṃ-pa*. Although *vāñka/vakra* often has a bad sense, as in the English ‘bent’ or ‘crooked’, the basic meaning of this, bent or curved, is in line with the commentarial glosses. The compound is thus to be taken as a tatpuruṣa, in both adjectival and nominal/abstract forms, and I suggest ‘inclined/inclination to good friends’ as a translation, to preserve the metaphor. (So also would ‘have a bent for’ or ‘a penchant for’, but neither seems appropriate in tone here.)

Although the grammar of this is complex, the meaning is straightforward. The triplet *k-m.*, *k-s.*, *k-s.*, is but an extension of the bahuvrīhi use of *k-m.* To be *k-m.*, *k-s.*, *k-s.* is important for a young monk at the beginning of training (e.g. A III 422, which adds that he *k-mitte sevamāno*, A IV 351, 356 = Ud 36 — this is the story of Meghiya, for present purposes a useful and instructive one). Although as a famous verse of the Dhammapada (160 = 380) has it, ‘one is one’s own master’ (*attā . . . attano nātho*), this can be seen as in some senses at least an end or ideal rather than a universal truth: a monk is to be ‘under protection’ (*sañātha*) rather than without protection (*anātha*) by being *k-m.*, *k-s.*, *k-s.* (A V 23–4); and being *k-m.*, *k-s.*, *k-s.* is one of the things that ‘make for protection’ (*nātha-karana*) (D III 266–7).³⁹

It is not only the individual monk who benefits from being *k-m.*, *k-s.*, *k-s.*, however. In the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta, one of the conditions set by the Buddha for the welfare of the Saṅgha as a whole after his death is that the monks should not be *pāpa-mittā*, *pāpa-sahāyā*, *pāpasampavañkā* (D II 78); when a monk is *k-m.*, *k-s.*, *k-s.*, he is regarded by senior, middling and junior monks alike with affection (he is

anukampita by them, A V 26). And, finally, a monk's being such is one of the ten 'occasions of fraternal living' (*sārāṇīya-dhamma*⁴⁰), which 'make for kindness and respect, which conduce to concord, lack of quarrelling, harmony and unity' (A V 89–91).

4. the abstract noun *kalyāṇamittatā*.

As I said earlier, the abstract noun *k-m-tā* is only used to mean 'the state of having good friends', that is, it is derived from the bahuvrīhi usage of *k-m*.⁴¹ Not only is there for the learner 'no other factor so helpful as *k-m-tā*' (It 10),⁴² but in general 'having good friends is the support (lit. "food") of (good) morals, sense-restraint the support of the holy life, and not quarrelling the support of friends' (A V 136).⁴³ This abstract form occurs, in fact, in many of the passages cited earlier. In one place, the virtue is recommended to laymen. In conversation with a Kolijan layman with the appealing name of Long-Knee Tigerfoot (Dighajānu Byagghapajja), the Buddha describes four things which 'lead to welfare and happiness for the son of (good) family in this life', one of which is *k-m-tā*. 'What is "having good friends"?' he continues. 'It is this: wherever the son of good family lives, he consorts with and converses with householders and their sons, old and young alike matured in virtue, and imitates their success in (or "acquisition of") faith, virtue, charity and wisdom' (A IV 282, cp. 322).⁴⁴

The nominal form of the word is not merely a variety of grammar, since it allows the topic to be dealt with in the style of the Abhidhamma, as a *dhamma*, an abstract unit of description and analysis. Many passages in the Sutta-pitaka do this (particularly in the Āṅguttara, e.g. I 13–8, 83, III 309–10, 448–9, V 146–9), and there is here a constant connexion between *k-m-tā* and another *dhamma*, the virtue of *sovacassatā*, 'being easy to speak to', as there is also between the corresponding vices of *pāpamittatā* and *dovacassatā*. The Dhammasaṅgani explains as follows, giving the vices first (which I shall follow, since I will cite the commentary, which comments only on the vices):

What is 'being difficult to speak to'? It is when there is contumacy, surliness, disobedience, contrariness, an-

tagonism, disregard, irreverence, disrespect and non-deference, when something has been spoken in accordance with the Teaching.

What is 'having bad friends'? It is following after, attending on, associating with, being devoted to and inclined to people who are without faith, of bad morals, without learning, mean, and of no wisdom.

What is 'being easy to speak to'? It is lack of contumacy, etc., when something has been spoken in accordance with the Teaching.

What is 'having good friends'? It is following after, etc., people who have faith, are of good morals, learned, generous and wise.⁴⁵

The commentary (As 393–4) elaborates *dovacassatā* specifically in relation to monastic discipline. What is 'spoken in accordance with the Teaching' is taken to be an accusation of an offence (*āpatti*) against the Vinaya precepts, and a demand for expiation (*paṭikarohi*). The offending monk is then said not only to refuse, but to answer back vituperatively and with malicious pleasure. The other terms given in elucidation of *dovacassatā* in Dhs 1325 are explained as a lack of deference to Elders and a refusal to accept their advice. 'Having bad friends', the commentary continues, is to be understood in the same way (*es' eva nayo*), since 'being difficult to speak to, having bad friends, etc., do not occur separately as aspects of mind (*cetasikadhammā*)'. The corresponding two virtues are then dealt with summarily: 'the couplet on being easy to speak to (*sovacassatā ca dukaniddeso pi*) is to be understood in the reverse manner'.

This close connexion between 'friendly' interpersonal relations, manner of mutual converse, and the institutionalised modes of a disciplinary hierarchy (a connexion already adumbrated in the Canon: see M I 95–6 and commentary, and cp. Th 588) led the prolific translator Nānamoli to attempt various renderings of *sovacassatā*: 'readiness to be spoken to' at Vism 107, 'easy admonishability' at Nett 40; *dovacassatā* is 'unamenability to correction' at Peṭ 254. B. C. Law at Pp 20, 24, has forthrightly 'obedience' and

'disobedience' respectively.⁴⁶ Although in comparison with Christian monasticism, Buddhism is remarkably free from undue emphasis on obedience, and it is certainly never seen as a virtue in itself, it is striking how friendship as a monastic virtue in both traditions comes much closer to the areas of discipline and control than our modern everyday use of the term might suggest.⁴⁷

BRISTOL

STEVEN COLLINS

Notes

Abbreviations follow the Critical Pāli Dictionary (= CPD).

- 1 Feer used the Sanskrit Ārya-kalyāṇamitra-sevana-sūtra, translating the title given in the Tibetan Kanjur.
- 2 I have made use of existing lexicographical materials, indices, cross-references, and not a little serendipity. There may of course be uses which have escaped me.
- 3 See S. N. Eisenstadt and L. Roniger, *Patrons, Clients and Friends. Interpersonal relations and the structure of trust in society*. (C.U.P. 1984), and the literature cited there. R. Brain, *Friends and Lovers* (Paladin, 1976) gives a brief and rather journalistic overview of relevant ethnography. R. E. Ewin, *Co-operation and Human Values* (Harvester, 1981), Chapter 9, Friendship, writing entirely from within a modern philosophical viewpoint, gives a sensitive and helpful account of how the necessary aspect of reciprocity — friendship as 'in some ways like an economic arrangement' (op. cit. p. 198) — is connected to the equally necessary moral virtues exercised in friendly relations.
- 4 Compare, for instance, Theognis, lines 31–128. Both popular and philosophical ideas are discussed in J-C. Fraisse, *Philia. La Notion d'Amitié dans la philosophie antique* (Paris, 1974). C. D. Small, *The Understanding of Friendship in the works of selected Church Fathers . . .* (Oxford D.Phil thesis, 1984) shows how the ideas of classical Greece continued to influence early Christian thinking on the subject.
- 5 PJ I 135, 17–8. *Passāmi 'ham Jambucitām sandītham saphalañ mittam / guñō kato mayā tuyham gunam pañkarosi me ti.* I translate *saphalañ* as 'who keeps a promise' on the model of Sanskrit *saphalañ kr̥*; it can mean simply 'advantageous' or 'profitable', and probably nuances of this sense are also present here.
- 6 See L. Sternbach, *Subhāṣita, gnomic and didactic literature (in India)* (Wiesbaden 1974), and compare the Cāṇakya-rāja-nīti, stanzas 117–28, in Sternbach's edition (Adyar 1963).

- 7 See Dhammanīti 96–111, Lokanīti 79–93, Mahāranīti 113–63, in Bechert and Braun, *Pāli Nīti texts from Burma* (PTS 1981).
- 8 *Mitra-bheda, mitra-samprāpti*. The Hitopadeśa's first book is called *mitralābha*. The parallels between these works and the Pāli Jātakas have long been recognised.
- 9 *Yo ve kataññū katavedi dhīro/Kalyāṇamitto dañhabhatti ca hoti / Dukhītassa sakkacca karoti kiccañ / tathāvidham sappurisañ vadanti.*
- 10 *Pūjako labhati pūjām vandako pañvandanam / Yaso kittiñ ca pappoti yo mittānañ na dūbhāti.* The commentary: *vandako ti Buddhādīnam kalyāṇamittānañ vandako punabbhave pativandanam labhati.*
- 11 This sentiment, which also occurs in the Sigālovāda Sutta, provides an interesting contrast with Christ's 'no greater love (*agapē*) has any man than that he should lay down his life for his friends (*tōn philōn*)' (John 15, 14). In Buddhism what is in one sense 'a greater love' is shown by monastic friends, whose practice of the Way is of far greater import than the ending of any given life-time (or as the Abhidhamma would say, 'any given life-faculty').
- 12 *Dve mittā; ḡārīka-mitto ca anāgārika-mitto ca. Katamo ḡārīka-mitto? Idh' ekacco duddadām dadāti, duccajam cajati, dukkaram karoti, dukkhamaram khamati, guyham assa ḣcikkhati guyham assa pariguyhati, ḣpadāsu na vijahati jīvitam c' assa attħāya paricattam hoti, khūne n' ātimariñati. Ayam ḡārīka-mitto. Katamo anāgārika-mitto? Idha bhikkhu piyo ca hoti manāpo ca hoti garu ca bhāvanīyo ca (vattā ca) vacanakkhamo ca gambhīrañ ca katham kattā, (na c') attħāne niyojeti, adhisile samādapeti, catunnam sati-paññānānam bhāvan' ānuyoge samādapeti. Ayam anāgārika-mitto.*
- 13 The text here omits *vattā ca* and *na c'*, both of which I insert on the model of A IV 32 (cf. Nett. 164), which is being followed here. The translation follows that of Nāṇamoli, *The Guide* (PTS 1962) p. 216–7.
- 14 The history of this term is curious. It was coined by Lord Coverdale in 1535 to translate the Hebrew *chesed*, used of the love God has for man. The Septuagint translators and subsequent Greek texts often render this by *eleos*, which is standardly rendered in English as 'pity' or 'compassion', which of course is the usual rendering of the Buddhist virtue of *karuñā*. I do not know who first used 'loving-kindness' for *mettā*.
- 15 He would thus learn the lesson taught at S I 37, that although in this life a companion (*sahāya*) may show friendship repeatedly when one is in need, in the next life one's friend is one's own good deeds! (*sayam katāni puññāni, tam mittam samparāyikan ti*).
- 16 It could also, of course, be based on the *tatpuruṣa* sense, that is as *kalyāṇa(purisa)-mittatā* rather than *kalyāṇamittatā*, but this is ruled out because the *tatpuruṣa* sense of *k-m*, itself is not found.
- 17 *Yassa silādi-guña-sampanno . . . upakārako mitto hoti, so puggalo kalyāṇamitto. Tassa bhāvo kalyāṇamittatā.*

- 18 Yassa pāpā lāmakā mittā, so pāpamitto. Pāpamittassa bhāvo pāpamittatā. (I assume throughout that the usage of *p-m.* and *p-m-tā* is perfectly valid evidence for *k-m.* and *k-m-tā*.)
- 19 Cited at *Elders' Verses II* (PTS 1971). The text of Thī-a has not been available to me. The reading *kalyāṇamittavantatā* is also found in some mss. of Līnathavannāñā II 400, including the Burmese Chatthasāgāyanā edition.
- 20 Yāya cetanāya puggalo pāpa-sampavānko nāma hoti, sā cetanā pāpamittatā.
- 21 Lāmake dussile mittapatiirūpake amiti.
- 22 Dhamma is used at A IV 32; at A IV 31 in the householder-friend passage, *anga* is preferred.
- 23 In the commentary to the *k-m-s-sutta* (Spk I 156–7), Ānanda is imagined to have thought that half of the holy life was *k-m-tā*, half was ‘individual effort’ (*paccata-purisa-kāra*). It is then said that this is wrong, since the two contributions cannot be separated, just as one cannot separate the individual contributions of a number of people holding a stone pillar, or of parents raising a child. Elsewhere, *k-m-tā* is said to lie at the basis of the Path (see text pp. 63–4), and this is given at Ud-a 222 in explanation of its being ‘the whole’ of the holy life.
- 24 Sammāsambuddho yeva sabbākārasampanno kalyāṇamitto. I give Nānamoli’s translation (*Path of Purification*, Colombo, 1975, 3rd ed. p. 99), which depends on taking *yeva* in a strong sense as ‘only’, which may not be necessary. Pe Maung Tin’s PTS translation (*The Path of Purity*, 1923–31, p. 114) has simply ‘the Buddha supreme himself was a good friend endowed with all qualities’.
- 25 Asubhakammika-Tissatherasadise asubhabhāvanārare kalyāṇamitte sevantassāpi kāmacchando pahiyati. I give Nānamoli’s (forthcoming, PTS) translation of Vibh-a for this and for the other *nīvaranāni*.
- 26 . . . appicchām santuṭṭham dhutavādām sallekhauttīm ācārasampannam. lajjīm pesalām garum bhāvaniyam vattāram vacanakkhamām codakam pāpagarāhim ovādakam anusāsakam viññāpakam sandassakam samādapakam samuttejakam sampahamsakam. I have substituted ‘one who can be spoken to’ for *vacanakkhamā*, following Nānamoli (see reference in note 12).
- 27 This is a difficult word. I give Woodward’s rendering (in *Gradual Sayings* vol I, PTS. 1972, pp. 100 foll.).
- 28 Bahussutā āgatāgamā dhammadharā vinayadharā mātikadharā.
- 29 I do not think we should necessarily take this as being implied by the use of (*upa)nissaya* in these kinds of passage.
- 30 The text reads *kalyāṇamittā jhānassa upanissā*. Nānamoli (*Pitaka-Disclosure*, PTS 1964 p. 202) suggests emending to *upanisā*, and translates this as ‘stipulate’. Words like (*upa)nissaya are common with *k-m.*, of course. (See CPD. s.v. *upanisā*.) Perhaps also we should amend to *k-m-tā* (and I have translated thus) since *kalyāṇa-sampavānkatā* is the next ‘basis’ for *jhāna* given. If *kalyāṇa-mittā* is retained, it should be taken as ‘good friends’ in the karmadhāraya sense.*

- 31 Buddhist Meditation (2nd. ed. Kuala Lumpur, 1975) pp. 95–7. See also Ps II 192, where the Buddha instructs the first five monks, cited by M. B. Carrithers, *The Forest Monks of Sri Lanka* (O.U.P. Delhi, 1983) p. 230.
- 32 I have discussed this notion in *Selfless Persons* (C.U.P., 1982), Chapter 5.2.3.
- 33 For modern examples see Carrithers (op. cit. note 31) Chapters 11 and 13.
- 34 Thus the commentary (Spk III 133) explains ‘established in the possession of good friends like the dawn, the Noble Path along with insight arises, like the appearance of the sun’.
- 35 The commentaries explain this term as those who ‘go along’ with the monk, or with whom he ‘goes along’, in the four postures (i.e. in everyday life): e.g. Sv 1046, te (sc. *kalyāṇamittā*) v’assa thāna-nisajjādisu saha ayanato sahāyā ti kalyāṇasahāyo. Ud-a 221, *kalyāṇapuggaleh’eva sabb’iriypathesu saha ayati, pavattati, na vinā tehi ti kalyāṇasahāyo*.
- 36 E.g. Avadāna-sātaka, ed. P. L. Vaidya (Mithila 1958), p. 95. The corresponding Sanskrit, Pali and Tibetan texts are given by Alsdorf.
- 37 For the words *ninna* and *pona* see K. R. Norman, “Middle Indo-Aryan Studies XV”, in *Journal of the Oriental Institute* (Baroda), 1979, vol. XXIX, Nos. 1–2, pp. 48–9; for *pabbhāra* see Edgerton, BHSD sv. *prāghbhāra*. (I am grateful to K. R. Norman for the information contained in this note.)
- 38 Private communication. He translates *kalyāṇasampavānka* as ‘(well)-disposed towards people who are *kalyāṇa*’.
- 39 On the other hand, monks who are *k-m.*, *k-s.*, *k-s.* become worthy of honour, etc., ‘a field of merit for the world’ (A V 199). Indeed, in one passage monks are said to be such if they display a variety of virtues, which include being *k-m.*, *k-s.*, *k-s.*, and also having the ‘Three-fold Knowledge’ (*tevijjā*), one of which, of course, is knowledge of the destruction of the *āsavā*, which is to say being enlightened (A IV 290–1). This is in marked contrast with the usual notion that being *k-m.*, etc. is a beginner’s virtue. (The commentary, Mp IV 140, remarks nonchalantly that the meaning of the passage is clear, *uttāna!*)
- 40 This is Rhys Davids’ rendering (*Dialogues of the Buddha*, vol. 3, PTS, 1921, p. 231). Miss Horner (*Middle Length Sayings*, vol. 3, PTS, 1959, p. 384 and note 3) and Woodward (*Gradual Sayings*, vol. 5, PTS, 1936, p. 64 and note 1) have simply ‘to be remembered’, deriving the word from *sar*, to remember.
- 41 *Kalyāṇasahāyatā* is also based on the bahuvrīhi *kalyāṇasahāya*: as argued in the text, *kalyāṇasampavānkatā* is a tatpurusa. Cp. As 394, commenting on *sampavañkatā* in Dhs 1326/8, translated on pp. 66–7 of this article, which has *tesu* (sc. *kalyāṇesu* or *pāpesu*) *puggalesu kāyena c’ eva cittena ca sampavānkabhbhāvo*.
- 42 This concerns what is external, *bāhirām*. For what is internal, *ajjhattam*, it is ‘careful attention’, *yoniso manasikāra* (It 9, S V 101–2).

- 43 *Kalyāṇamittatā silānaṁ āhāro, indriyasaṁvavo brahma-cariyassa āhāro, avisamvādanā mittānam āhāro.*
- 44 *Kulaputto yasmīm gāme vā nigame vā paṭīvasati, tattha ye te honi gahapati vā gahapatiputtā vā daharā vā vuddhasilino vuddhā vā vuddha-silino saddhāsampannā, sīlasampannā, cāgasampannā, paññāsampannā, tehi saddhim santiṭṭhati sallapati sākaccham samāpajjati; yathārūpānam saddhāsampannānam saddhāsampadām anusikkhati, yathārūpānam sila-, . . . cāga-, . . . paññāsampannānam paññāsampadām anusikkhati.* My translation is slightly abridged. The whole Sutta is repeated at A IV 285–9 with Ujjayo the Brahmin.
- 45 1325. *Tattha katamā dovacassatā?*
Sahadhammike vuccamāne dovacassatā�am dovacassiyam dovacassatā vippatikūlagāhitā vipaccanikasātā anādariyam anādaratā agāravatā appaṭissavatā — ayam vuccati dovacassatā.
1326. *Tattha katamā pāpamittatā?*
Ye te puggalā assaddhā dussilā appassutā macchārino duppaññā — yā tesam sevanā nisevanā samsevanā bhajanā sambhajanā bhatti sambhatti sampavānatā — ayam vuccati pāpamittatā.
1327. *Tattha katamā sovacassatā?*
Sahadhammike vuccamāne sovacassatā�am sovacassiyam sovacassatā appaṭikūlagāhitā avipaccanikasātā sagāravatā sappaṭissavatā — ayam vuccati sovacassatā.
1328. *Tattha katamā kalyāṇamittatā?*
Ye te puggalā saddhā silavanto bahussutā cāgavanto paññāvanto — yā tesam sevanā nisevanā samsevanā bhajanā sambhajanā bhatti sambhatti sampavānatā — ayam vuccati kalyāṇamittatā.
- See also Vbh 359, 369, 371, Pp 20, 24. The translation of these synonyms or near-synonyms is necessarily slightly arbitrary. In the passage on *pāpamittatā* I have given only ‘following after’ for *sevanā*, *nisevanā* and *samsevanā*, and ‘being devoted to’ for both *bhatti* and *sambhatti*.
- 46 Nāṇamoli, *Path of Purification*, p. 108, *The Guide*, p. 63, *Pitaka-Disclosure*, p. 342. B. C. Law, *Human Types* (PTS, 1924) pp. 30, 35. See also *Middle Length Sayings*, vol. I pp. 125–6, and *Book of the Discipline* vol. I (PTS, 1938) p. 310.
- 47 In Christianity, compare, for example, the discussion of friendship by John Cassian (3rd–4th century), in his sixteenth Conference, in E. Pichery (ed. and transl.) *Jean Cassien: Conférences*, vol. II pp. 221–247 (*Sources Chrétiennes*, no. 54, Paris, 1958).

THREE SOULS, ONE OR NONE: THE VAGARIES OF A PĀLI PERICOPE.

Early in that mysterious text, the *Cakkavatti-sihanāda Suttā*, is a recommendation how the ideal ruler should behave. From time to time, he is told, he is to ask advice of the best holy men available; they are characterized in three expressions (D III 61):¹ *Ye ca te tāta vijite samana-brāhmaṇā mada-ppamādā paṭīviratā khanti-soracce niviṭṭhā ekam attānaṁ damenti ekam attānaṁ samenti ekam attānaṁ parinibbāpenti, te kālena kālam upasamkamityā paripuccheyyāsi.* The first two characterizations, ‘abstaining from intoxication and carelessness and attached to patience and gentleness’ are straightforward. It is the third, from the first *ekam* to *parinibbāpenti*, which seems surprising and is the subject of this article. Though the text is famous, I am not aware that any scholar has drawn attention to what I shall from now on refer to as ‘our expression’ before.² Mr. and Mrs. Rhys Davids translate: ‘each mastering self, each calming self, each perfecting self’, and offer no comment. They seem to be taking each *ekam* as a nominative, presumably positing that the final *m* is a junction consonant; they translate as if it were a nominative singular, but of course with a plural verb that is impossible.

One’s first impression of the grammar — an impression which I shall show to be correct — is that *ekam* must be an accusative singular masculine qualifying *attānaṁ*. The translators evidently evaded this interpretation because it yields an odd meaning: Buddhists deny the existence of an *attan*, a self. The word can also be used as a reflexive pronoun, and one can imagine speaking of mastering and calming oneself, *attānaṁ*, but *parinibbāpenti*, a Buddhist technical term for putting out the fires of passion, hate and delusion, sits strangely with *attānaṁ*. Worse still, the sentence runs as if the repetition of *eka* could be distributive: ‘they master one self, tame one self, bring one self to *nibbāna*.’ That sounds as if people who are supposed to realize their lack of self are being credited with three.